UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,597	08/06/2003	Yong Cui	TI-35649	1391

23494 7590 06/24/2008

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999
DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER	
CARDENAS NAVIA, JAIME F	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/24/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@ti.com
uspto@dlemail.itg.ti.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/635,597	CUI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jaime Cardenas-Navia	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 March 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *06 August 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1. This **FINAL** office action is in response to communications received on March 27, 2008. Claims 1-21 have been amended. Claims 1-21 are pending.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendments to the specification are **sufficient to overcome the objections to the specification** set forth in the previous office action.

3. Applicant's amendments to the claims are **sufficient to overcome the objections to the claims** as set forth in the previous office action.

4. Applicant's amendments to the claims are **sufficient to overcome the 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, rejections** as set forth in the previous office action.

5. Applicant's amendments to the claims are **sufficient to overcome the 35 USC § 101 rejections** as set forth in the previous office action.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed March 27, 2008 have been fully considered by the examiner. In particular, Applicant argues regarding independent claims 1, 8, and 15 that (1) Lofton does not teach or suggest how to "attach a file **stored in the memory** to the time management entry," and that (2) Lofton does not teach or suggest attaching a file stored in the memory of **the hand-held computer device** to a time management entry, and **displaying the file on a display of the hand-held computer device**. Applicant additionally argues (3) that dependent claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 are allowable because of their dependence to claims 1, 8, and 15 and "in view of their novel claim features."

Regarding argument (1), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner cites par. 23, lines 1-6 of Lofton, which clearly states "a linking mechanism for linking event data with another document." "Event data" is the time management entry, and "another document" is the file being attached. Par. 23, lines 11-14 state "A user may supply the link data from the user's own outside data, which, prior to initializing the user outside data as link data, may have been only available to the user outside the system." Here, Lofton clearly teaches that the file being attached was stored on the memory of the device prior to being uploaded onto the system server.

Regarding argument (2), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner cites col. 3, lines 52-55 of Worthington, which state, "the invention is implemented through a data processing unit such as a mainframe computer, a home computer, **or a laptop computer**." A laptop computer is a handheld computer device. Additionally, Examiner cites par. 112, lines 10-12 of Lofton which state, "the link data associated with the file 'directions' is accessed and made available for

viewing." Worthington combined with Lofton clearly teaches displaying the file on a display of the hand-held computer device.

Regarding argument (3), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claims 1, 8, and 15 are not allowable as per the response to arguments (1) and (2) above. As per the "novel claim features," they have already been addressed in the response to arguments (1) and (2) above, or were anticipated in the first Office Action as a response to objections and rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 1-5, 8-12, and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Worthington (US 6,442,527 B1) in view of Lofton (US 2003/0154116 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Worthington teaches:

A hand-held computer device comprising a processor, memory, and a medium storing software (col. 3, lines 52-55, laptop computer is a hand-held computer device, it is old and well-known for steps to be stored in software) that causes the processor to perform the following steps:

a. create a time management entry in a time management application (col. 1, lines 61-64, col. 2, lines 24-33).

Worthington does not teach:

b. attach a file to the time management entry.

Lofton teaches:

b. attach a file stored in the memory to the time management entry (par. 23, lines 1-14, par. 112, lines 1-15); and

c. display the file on a display of the hand-held computer device (par. 112, lines 1-15).

The inventions of Worthington and Lofton pertain to scheduling time management entries in a time management application. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art

and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Lofton does not teach away from or contradict Worthington, but rather, teaches an additional feature that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the fact that additional information is sometimes desired for certain appointments and tasks, such as the example for directions to a scheduled soccer game taught by Lofton (par. 112, lines 5-7).

Regarding claim 2, Worthington teaches wherein the time management entry is an appointment in the time management application (col. 2, line 30, col. 5, lines 49-55).

Examiner officially notes that the example of a time management entry of "an appointment" is nonfunctional descriptive material, because it does not alter the article, and the application would be operable in the same manner regardless of if the time management entry is an appointment, an event, a task, etc. Thus, this nonfunctional descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability.

Regarding claim 3, Worthington teaches wherein the time management entry is a task in the time management application (col. 2, lines 31, col. 5, lines 49-52, 55-58).

Examiner officially notes that the example of a time management entry of "a task" is nonfunctional descriptive material, because it does not alter the article, and the application would be operable in the same manner regardless of if the time management entry is an appointment, an event, a task, etc. Thus, this nonfunctional descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability.

Regarding claim 4, Worthington teaches wherein the time management applications is a calendar, and wherein the task is listed in an assignments due list managed by the calendar time management application (col. 2, line 31, col. 5, lines 49-58, Figures 4 and 5).

Regarding claim 5, Worthington does not teach wherein time periods in the calendar time management application are class periods.

Lofton teaches wherein the time periods in the calendar time management application are class periods (par. 127, lines 7-10).

The inventions of Worthington and Lofton pertain to scheduling time management entries in a time management application. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Lofton does not teach away from or contradict Worthington, but rather, teaches a specific embodiment that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the advantage in ease of use provided by tailoring the invention to an educational environment.

Examiner officially notes that calling the time periods class periods is nonfunctional descriptive material, because it does not alter the article, and the application would be operable in the same manner regardless of if the time periods are class periods, work shifts, etc. Thus, this nonfunctional descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability.

Regarding claims 8-12 and 15-19, Worthington teaches that the invention can be embodied in a data processing unit, such as a laptop computer (col. 3, lines 52-55). It is thus old

and well-known if not inherent that a laptop computer would contain a processor, a memory coupled to the processor, a storage medium coupled to the processor, a display, and would be able to run software that would perform the steps of claims 8 and 15. It is also inherent that a laptop is a portable computing device. Claims 8-12 and 15-19 are rejected using the same art and rational as used above in rejecting claims 1-5.

9. **Claims 6-7, 13-14, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Worthington (US 6,442,527 B1) in view of Lofton (US 2003/0154116 A1), further in view of Johnson JR. (US 2004/0078752 A1).

Regarding claims 6, 13, and 20, neither Worthington nor Lofton teach wherein the attached file's association with the time management entry is indicated with a graphical icon in the application near the time management entry.

Lofton teaches wherein the attached file's association with the time management entry is indicated in the application near the time management entry (par. 112, lines 1-15).

Johnson JR teaches that the time management entry is indicated with a "document reference or document identifier" (par. 42, lines 4-8). Though Johnson JR does not specifically teach "graphical icon," "graphical icon" is an obvious variation of "document identifier."

The inventions of Lofton and Johnson JR pertain to attaching files to scheduled calendar events. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Lofton and Johnson JR do not teach away from or contradict Worthington, but rather, elaborate on a detail that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have

yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the improvement in aesthetics and ease of use.

Examiner officially notes that specifying that the file attached to the time management entry is indicated with a graphical icon is nonfunctional descriptive material, because it does not alter the article, and the application would be operable in the same manner regardless of how the file attached to the time management entry is indicated. Thus, this nonfunctional descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability.

Regarding claims 7, 14, and 21, neither Worthington nor Lofton teach wherein a user is able to activate the application associated with the attached file and view the attached file by selecting the graphical icon.

Lofton teaches wherein the user is able to activate the application associated with the attached file and view the attached file by selecting the link (par. 112, lines 1-15).

Johnson JR teaches that the time management entry is indicated with a "document reference or document identifier" (par. 42, lines 4-8). Though Johnson JR does not specifically teach "graphical icon," "graphical icon" is an obvious if not inherent variation of "document identifier."

The inventions of Lofton and Johnson JR pertain to attaching files to scheduled calendar events. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Johnson JR and Lofton do not teach away from or contradict Worthington, but rather, elaborate on a detail that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have

yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the improvement in aesthetics and ease of use.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ruvolo et al. (US 6,978,246 B1) teaches storing information as attachments to calendar events.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jaime Cardenas-Navia whose telephone number is (571)270-1525. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 9:30AM - 8:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Van Doren can be reached on (571) 272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

May 7, 2008

/Jaime Cardenas-Navia/
Examiner, Art Unit 3623

/Andre Boyce/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623